arXiv:math/9702209v1 [math.LO] 26 Feb 1997

# Coloring ordinals by reals

Sakaé Fuchino

This is yet a preliminary version of the paper.
Any comments are appreciated.

February 24, 1997

**Abstract**

We introduce several new set-theoretic axioms formulated in terms of coloring of ordinals by reals. We show that these axioms generalize the axioms considered by I. Juhász, L. Soukup and Z. Szentmiklóssy [4], and give a class of partial orderings including Cohen p.o.-sets which force these axioms.

## 1 Introduction

In [4], I. Juhász, L. Soukup and Z. Szentmiklóssy introduced several new set-theoretic axioms which hold in Cohen models, i.e. the models of ZFC obtained by adding appropriate number of Cohen reals to a ground model, e.g. of ZFC + CH. They showed that these axioms imply various assertions which were previously known to hold in Cohen models. In the present paper, we consider generalizations of these axioms in terms of coloring of ordinals by reals — Homogeneity Principle (HP) in section 3 and Injectivity Principle (IP) in section 4. The formulation of HP resembles that of the Open Coloring Axiom (OCA). Though it will be shown that both of our axioms are inconsistent with OCA (see Lemma 3.3, (3) and Lemma 4.2, (3)). In section 5, we prove that our axioms (and hence also the axioms of Juhász, Soukup and Szentmiklóssy) hold not only in Cohen models but also in many other models of set-theory which can be quite different from the Cohen models from the point of view of infinitary combinatorics.

## 2 Preliminaries

For a cardinal $\kappa$, $\mathcal{H}(\kappa)$ denotes the set of all sets of hereditary cardinality $< \kappa$. In particular $\mathcal{H}(\aleph_1)$ is the set of hereditarily countable sets. We say that a subset $X$ of $\mathcal{H}(\aleph_1)$ is *definable* if there is a formula $\varphi(x)$ of the first order logic in the language of set-theory with parameters from $\mathcal{H}(\aleph_1)$ such that

$$X = \{a \in \mathcal{H}(\aleph_1) \,:\, (\mathcal{H}(\aleph_1), \in) \models \varphi[a]\}.$$

Note that every Borel, analytic or projective sets are definable in the sense as above.

For a mapping $f$ and $X \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(f)$, $f``X$ denotes the image of $X$ by $f$.

Following [4], we write for a set $X$, $n \in \omega$ and $X_0, \ldots, X_{n-1} \subseteq X$:

$$(X)^n = \{\langle x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}\rangle \in X^n \,:\, x_i \neq x_j \text{ for all } i < j < n\};$$
$$(X)^{<\aleph_0} = \dot{\bigcup}_{n\in\omega}(X)^n;$$
$$(X_0, \ldots, X_{n-1}) = \{\langle x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}\rangle \in (X)^n \,:\, x_0 \in X_0, \ldots, x_{n-1} \in X_{n-1}\}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$, $(\mathcal{P}(\omega))^n$, $(\mathcal{P}(\omega))^{<\aleph_0}$ etc. are definable in our sense. Hence we may also speak of definable subsets of these sets.

For the consistency proof in section 5, we use the following enhancement of the well-known $\Delta$-system lemma, due to Erdős and Rado. This theorem was already used in Juhász, Soukup and Szentmiklóssy [4] and its detailed proof is also given there. Nevertheless, we present here another proof of the theorem using the method of elementary submodels. The proof is essentially the same as the proof of usual $\Delta$-system lemma given in [5].

**Theorem 2.1** (Erdős-Rado) *Suppose that $\kappa$ and $\lambda$ are cardinals such that $\mu^\lambda < \kappa$ for all $\mu < \kappa$ and $\kappa$ is regular. If $\langle x_\alpha \,:\, \alpha \in S\rangle$ is a sequence of sets of cardinality $\leq \lambda$ for a stationary subset $S$ of $\{\alpha < \kappa \,:\, \mathrm{cof}(\alpha) > \lambda\}$, then there is a stationary $I \subseteq S$ such that $\{x_\alpha \,:\, \alpha \in I\}$ forms a $\Delta$-system.*

**Proof** Without loss of generality we may assume that $x_\alpha \subseteq \kappa$ for every $\alpha \in S$. By Fodor's lemma and by assumption on $\kappa$ and $\lambda$, we may further assume that there is a stationary $I' \subseteq S$ such that $\sup(x_\alpha) \geq \alpha$ for every $\alpha \in I'$.

Let $\chi$ be sufficiently large. By the assumptions on $\kappa$ and $\lambda$ there is $M \prec \mathcal{H}(\chi)$ such that $\langle x_\alpha \,:\, \alpha \in S\rangle$, $I'$,$\kappa$, $\lambda \in M$; $|\,M\,| < \kappa$; $[M]^{\leq\lambda} \subseteq M$ and $M \cap \kappa \in I'$. Let $\alpha_1 = M \cap \kappa$ and $r = x_{\alpha_1} \cap M$. Then $r \in M$. Hence $\alpha_0 = (\sup r) + 1$ is an element fo $M$.

For any $\alpha_0 \leq \alpha^* < \alpha_1$, we have $\mathcal{H}(\chi) \models \alpha^* < \alpha_1 \wedge x_{\alpha_1} \cap \alpha^* = r$. Hence $\mathcal{H}(\chi) \models \exists\beta < \kappa(\alpha^* < \beta \wedge x_\beta \cap \alpha^* = r)$. By elementarity, it follows that

$$M \models \exists\beta < \kappa(\alpha^* < \beta \wedge x_\beta \cap \alpha^* = r).$$

Since $\alpha_1 = \kappa \cap M$, it follows that

$$M \models \forall \alpha < \kappa (\alpha_0 \leq \alpha \rightarrow \exists \beta < \kappa \, (\alpha < \beta \wedge x_\beta \cap \alpha = r)).$$

Again by elementarity the same sentence also holds in $\mathcal{H}(\chi)$ and hence in $V$ as $\chi$ was taken sufficiently large.

Now let $\xi_\alpha$, $\alpha < \kappa$ be the increasing sequence of ordinal numbers defined inductively by: $\xi_0 =$ the minimal $\xi \in I'$ such that $x_\xi \cap \alpha_0 = r$ and for $\alpha > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_\alpha = {} & \text{the minimal } \xi \in I' \text{ such that } \xi > \sup(\bigcup\{x_{\xi_\beta} \, : \, \beta < \alpha\}) \text{ and} \\ & x_\xi \cap \sup(\bigcup\{x_{\xi_\beta} \, : \, \beta < \alpha\}) = r. \end{aligned}$$

Let $I = \{\xi_\alpha \, : \, \alpha < \kappa\}$. Then $I \subseteq I'$. Since the definition above can be performed by using only parameters from $M$, we have $I \in M$. Clearly $\{x_\alpha \, : \, \alpha \in I\}$ forms a $\Delta$-system with the root $r$ and $I \in M$. Hence it is enough to show that $I$ is stationary.

First note that $\alpha_1 = \xi_{\alpha_1}$ and hence $\alpha_1 \in I$. If $C \in M$ is a club subset of $\kappa$, then $\alpha_1 \in C$. Hence $C \cap I \neq \emptyset$. By elementarity it follows that $M \models C \cap I \neq \emptyset$. Thus we have $M \models$"$I$ is sataionary". Again by elementarity and by the choice of $\chi$ being sufficiently large, it follows that $I$ is really stationary. ❑ (Theorem 2.1)

The condition $\mu^\lambda < \kappa$ for all $\mu < \kappa$ is a necessary one: suppose that $\kappa = \aleph_{\omega+1}$ and $\lambda = \aleph_0$. Let $S = \{\alpha < \kappa \, : \, \mathrm{cof}(\alpha) = \omega\}$. For $\alpha \in S$ let $x_\alpha$ be a cofinal subset of $\alpha$ of order type $\omega$. Then there is no staionary $I \subseteq S$ such that $\{x_\alpha \, : \, \alpha \in I\}$ build a $\Delta$-system. Our terminology on forcing is standard and mainly based on K. Kunen [8]. We assume that the partial orderings (or p.o.-sets, as in [8]) $P$ we consider here have always the largest element $\mathbb{1}_P$. For a partial ordering $P$, we assume that the $P$-names are defined just as in [8] but use Baumgartner's notation for $P$-names so that $P$-names are represented by dotted alphabets like $\dot{x}$, $\dot{y}$, $\dot{z}$ etc. while the standard names of ground model sets $x$, $y$, $z$ etc. are denoted by $\check{x}$, $\check{y}$, $\check{z}$ etc. or, if it is clear from the context, simply by the same symbols $x$, $y$, $z$ etc. Unlike [8], we take here the naïve (and strictly speaking incorrect) approach that our ground model is simply the set-theoretic universe $V$. With *subordering* $Q$ of $P$ we mean $Q \subseteq P$ with the ordering induced from the ordering of $P$ such that $\mathbb{1}_P \in Q$ and hence $\mathbb{1}_Q = \mathbb{1}_P$; and that, for any $q$, $r \in Q$, if $q$ and $r$ are incompatible in $Q$ then they are incompatible in $P$ as well. A subordering $Q$ of a partial ordering $P$ is called a *regular subordering* of $P$ if every maximal antichain in $Q$ is also a maximal antichain in $P$. If $Q$ is a regular subordering of $P$. As well-known, if $G$ is a $P$-generic filter over $V$ and $Q$ is a regular subordering of $P$, then $G \cap Q$ is $Q$-generic over $V$.

As in [8], $\mathrm{Fn}(X, 2)$ denotes the partial ordering for adding $|\, X \,|$ many Cohen reals, i.e. $\{p \, : \, \mathrm{dom}(p) \subseteq X, \mathrm{rng}(p) \subseteq 2, |\, p \,| < \aleph_0\}$ ordered by $p \leq q \Leftrightarrow p \supseteq q$.

$\dot{G}_P$ or simply $\dot{G}$ is the standard name of $P$ generic set which may be defined as $\{\langle p, \check{p}\rangle : p \in P\}$.

For a partial ordering $Q$ and an index set $I$, the pseudo product $\Pi^*_I Q$ of $Q$ over $I$ was introduced in S. Fuchino, S. Shelah and L. Soukup [7] as:

$$\Pi^*_I Q = \{p \in {}^I Q : |\{i \in I : p(i) \neq \mathbb{1}_Q\}| \leq \aleph_0\}$$

with the ordering

$$p \leq q \Leftrightarrow p(i) \leq q(i) \text{ for all } i \in I \text{ and } \{i \in I : p(i) \lneq q(i) \lneq \mathbb{1}_Q\} \text{ is finite.}$$

Recall that ($\clubsuit$) is the following weakening of $\diamondsuit$-principle:

($\clubsuit$): *There exists a sequence $(x_\gamma)_{\gamma \in Lim(\omega_1)}$ of countable subsets of $\omega_1$ such that for every $\gamma \in Lim(\omega_1)$, $x_\gamma$ is a cofinal subset of $\gamma$ with $otp(x_\gamma) = \omega$ and for every $y \in [\omega_1]^{\aleph_1}$ there is $\gamma \in Lim(\omega_1)$ such that $x_\gamma \subseteq y$.*

Here, $Lim(\omega_1)$ denotes the set of all limit ordinals $< \omega_1$.

In general, ($\clubsuit$) does not hold in a Cohen model. This is because MA($Cohen$) — Martin's axiom restricted to the partial orderings of the form $\mathrm{Fn}(\kappa, 2)$ — can hold in such a model and, as easily seen, MA($Cohen$) implies the negation of ($\clubsuit$). However, the pseudo product of the form $\Pi^*_\kappa \mathrm{Fn}(\omega, 2)$ for uncountable $\kappa$ forces ($\clubsuit$). For more details and the proof of the following, see [7] (for (2), see also Lemma 5.5).

**Lemma 2.2** (S. Fuchino, S. Shelah and L. Soukup [7]) *Let $P = \Pi^*_\kappa \mathrm{Fn}(\omega, 2)$. Then:*

(1) *$P$ is proper.*

(2) *$P$ satisfies the $(2^{\aleph_0})^+$-cc.*

(3) $\Vdash_P$ "($\clubsuit$)".

(4) *If the ground model satisfies the* CH *and $\kappa^{\aleph_0} = \kappa$, then we have*

$$\Vdash_P \text{"MA}(countable)\text{"}.$$ □

# 3 Homogeneity Principle

One of our axioms is formulated as follows. First, for a cardinal $\kappa$, let HP($\kappa$) be the following assertion:

HP($\kappa$): *For any $f : \kappa \to \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ and any definable $A \subseteq (\mathcal{P}(\omega))^{<\aleph_0}$, either*

(h0) *there is a stationary $D \subseteq \kappa$ such that $(f``D)^{<\aleph_0} \subseteq A$; or*

(h1) *there are $n \in \omega$, $n > 0$ and stationary $D_0, \ldots, D_{n-1} \subseteq \kappa$ such that $(f``D_0, \ldots, f``D_{n-1}) \subseteq (\mathcal{P}(\omega))^n \setminus A$.*

By definition of definability, it is clear that $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$ remains the same when $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ in this definition is replaced by one of ${}^{\omega}\omega$, ${}^{\omega}2$, $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{R}^2$, $\cdots$.

For $k \geq 1$, let $\mathrm{HP}_k(\kappa)$ be the assertion:

$\mathrm{HP}_k(\kappa)$: *For any $f : \kappa \to \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ and any definable $A \subseteq (\mathcal{P}(\omega))^k$, either*

(h0') *there is a stationary $D \subseteq \kappa$ such that $(f``D)^k \subseteq A$; or*

(h1') *there are stationary $D_0, \ldots, D_{k-1} \subseteq \kappa$ such that $(f``D_0, \ldots, f``D_{k-1}) \subseteq (\mathcal{P}(\omega))^k \setminus A$.*

**Lemma 3.1** (0) $\mathrm{HP}_1(\kappa)$ *holds for every regular $\kappa$.*

(1) *If $1 \leq k < k' < \omega$, then $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$ implies $\mathrm{HP}_{k'}(\kappa)$ and $\mathrm{HP}_{k'}(\kappa)$ implies $\mathrm{HP}_k(\kappa)$.*

(2) *If $\mathrm{cof}(\kappa) = \lambda$ and $\mathrm{HP}(\lambda)$, then $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$ also holds.*

(3) $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$ *holds for any regular $\kappa > 2^{\aleph_0}$.*

(4) *If $\mathrm{HP}_2(\kappa)$, then there is no subset $X$ of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ with a definable $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\omega)^2$ such that $A \cap X^2$ is a well-ordering on $X$ of order-type $\kappa$. In particular, $\kappa$ is not embeddable into $(\mathcal{P}(\omega)/fin, \subseteq^*)$.*

(5) $\neg\mathrm{HP}_2(\aleph_1)$. *Hence by (1), we have $\neg\mathrm{HP}_k(\aleph_1)$ for every $k \geq 2$ and $\neg\mathrm{HP}(\aleph_1)$.*

**Proof** (0) : Trivial.

(1) : To show that $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$ implies $\mathrm{HP}_{k'}(\kappa)$, let $f : \kappa \to \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ and $A' \subseteq (\mathcal{P}(\omega))^k$ be definable. Let

$$A = (\mathcal{P}(\omega))^1 \cup \cdots \cup (\mathcal{P}(\omega))^{k'-1} \cup \bigcup_{l \geq k'} \{\langle x_0, \ldots, x_{l-1}\rangle \in (\mathcal{P}(\omega))^l \,:\, \langle x_0, \ldots, x_{k-1}\rangle \in A'\}.$$

Then if (h0) holds for $f$ and $A$ above, we can easily see that (h0') of $HP_{k'}(\kappa)$ holds for $f$ and $A'$. Similarly for (h1). The implication of $\mathrm{HP}_k(\kappa)$ form $\mathrm{HP}_{k'}(\kappa)$ can be shown similarly.

(2) : Easy.

(3) : Let $\kappa > 2^{\aleph_0}$ be a regular cardinal. Suppose that $f : \kappa \to \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ and $A$ are as in the definition of $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$. Then there is a stationary $D \subseteq \kappa$ such that $f \restriction D$ is constant. If (h0) in the definition of $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$ does not hold then we must have $(f``D)^1 \cap A = \emptyset$ since $(f``D)^n = \emptyset$ for $n > 1$. Hence (h1) holds with $n = 1$ and $D_0 = D$.

(4) : Suppose that $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\omega)$, $A \subseteq (\mathcal{P}(\omega))^2$ is definable and $A \cap (X)^2$ is a well-ordering on $X$ of order type $\kappa$. If $f : \kappa \to \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ is the mapping sending $\alpha$ to the $\alpha$'th element of $X$ with respect to $A$ then none of conditions (h0') and (h1') in the definition of $\mathrm{HP}_2(\kappa)$ can hold: for any stationary $D \subseteq \kappa$, if $\alpha$, $\beta \in D$ are such

that $\beta < \alpha$, then we have $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \notin A$; on the other hand, if $D_0$, $D_1$ are stationary subsets of $\kappa$, then, taking $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \in (D_0, D_1)$ such that $\alpha < \beta$, we have $\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \in A$.

(5) follows immediately from (4) since there is a subset of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/fin$ of order-type $\omega_1$ with respect to $\subseteq^*$. ❑ (Lemma 3.1)

The following is still open:

**Problem 3.2** *Does* $\mathrm{HP}_2(\kappa)$ *imply* $\mathrm{HP}_k(\kappa)$ *for* $k \geq 3$*? Does it imply* $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$*?*

Now we define the *Homogeneity Principle* (HP) as the assertion:

HP: $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$ holds for every regular $\kappa > \aleph_1$.

**Lemma 3.3** (1) CH *implies* HP.

(2) $\mathrm{HP}_2(\aleph_2)$ *and hence* HP *implies* $\mathbf{b} = \aleph_1$.

(3) OCA *implies* $\neg\mathrm{HP}_2(\aleph_2)$ *and hence* $\neg$HP.

(4) $\mathrm{HP}_2(\aleph_2)$ *and hence* HP *implies that* $\mathcal{P}(\omega_1)/$*countable is not embeddable into* $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/fin$.

**Proof** (1) follows from Lemma 3.1, (3).

(2): By Lemma 3.1, (4), it follows from $\mathrm{HP}_2(\aleph_2)$ that $\mathbf{b} < \aleph_2$.

(3): OCA implies $\mathbf{b} = \aleph_2$ (see e.g. [3]). By (2), this implies $\neg\mathrm{HP}_2(\aleph_2)$.

(4): It is known that $\omega_2$ is embeddable into $\mathcal{P}(\omega_1)/$*countable* (see e.g. [6], p48). Hence the assertion follows from Lemma 3.1, (4).

❑ (Lemma 3.3)

Let $\mathrm{HP}^+(\kappa)$ be the assertion which is obtained when the assumption on $A$ being definable is dropped from the definition of $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$ and $\mathrm{HP}^+$ be the corresponding axiom. The proof of Lemma 3.1, (4) shows that $\mathrm{HP}^+(\kappa)$ cannot hold for any $\kappa \leq 2^{\aleph_0}$ under ZFC. On the other hand, the proof of Lemma 3.1, (3) works also for this stronger form of the homogeneity principle. Hence we see that $\mathrm{HP}^+$ is just equivalent to CH.

One of the principles considered by Juhász, Soukup and Szentmiklóssy [4] is the following $C^s(\kappa)$ for a cardinal $\kappa$.

$C^s(\kappa)$: *For any* $T \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$ *and any matrix* $\langle a(\alpha, n) : \alpha < \kappa, n \in \omega \rangle$ *of subsets of* $\omega$*, either*

- (c0) *there is a stationary* $S \subseteq \kappa$ *such that for each* $t \in T$ *and* $s \in (S)^{|t|}$ *we have* $\bigcap_{i<|t|} a(s(i), t(i)) \neq \emptyset$*; or*
- (c1) *there are* $t \in T$ *and stationary* $D_0, \ldots, D_{|t|-1} \subseteq \kappa$ *such that for every* $s \in (D_0, \ldots, D_{|t|-1})$ *we have* $\bigcap_{i<|t|} a(s(i), t(i)) = \emptyset$.

A sort of the dual of $C^s(\kappa)$ is called $\hat{C}^s(\kappa)$ by Juhász, Soukup and Szentmiklóssy [4]:

$\hat{C}^s(\kappa)$: *For any $T \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$ and any matrix $\langle a(\alpha, n) : \alpha < \kappa, n \in \omega\rangle$ of subsets of $\omega$, either*

- ($\hat{\text{c}}0$) *there is a stationary $S \subseteq \kappa$ such that for each $t \in T$ and $s \in (S)^{|t|}$ we have $|\bigcap_{i<|t|} a(s(i), t(i))| < \aleph_0$; or*
- ($\hat{\text{c}}1$) *there are $t \in T$ and stationary $D_0, \ldots, D_{|t|-1} \subseteq \kappa$ such that for every $s \in (D_0, \ldots, D_{|t|-1})$ we have $|\bigcap_{i<|t|} a(s(i), t(i))| = \aleph_0$.*

The weakenings of these assertions $C(\kappa)$ and $\hat{C}(\kappa)$ are also considered in [4], which are obtained when we replace "stationary ..." by "... of cardinality $\kappa$" in the definition of $C^s(\kappa)$ and $\hat{C}^s(\kappa)$ respectively. Note that we could also consider the version of $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$ and HP obtained by replacing stationarity by cardinality $\kappa$; it is easily checked that Lemmas 3.1, 3.3 still hold under this weaker version of Homogeneity Principle.

**Lemma 3.4** *For every $\kappa$, $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$ implies $C^s(\kappa)$ and $\hat{C}^s(\kappa)$.*

**Proof** We show that $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$ implies $C^s(\kappa)$. The assertion for $\hat{C}^s(\kappa)$ can be proved similarly.

First, with the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.1,(3), we can prove easily that $C^s(\kappa)$ (and also $\hat{C}^s(\kappa)$) holds for every regular $\kappa > 2^{\aleph_0}$. Hence without loss of generality we may assume that $\kappa \leq 2^{\aleph_0}$.

Let $\langle t_i : i \in \omega\rangle$ be an enumeration of $\omega^{<\omega}$ such that $|t_i| \leq i$ for every $i \in \omega$. Let $\iota : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \to \mathcal{P}(\omega)^{\aleph_0}$ be some definable bijection. For $x \in \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ and let $(x)_i$ denote the $i$'th component of $\iota(x)$ for each $i \in \omega$.

Now suppose that $T \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$ and $\langle a(\alpha, n) : \alpha < \kappa,\ n \in \omega\rangle$ is a matrix of subsets of $\omega$. Let $g : \kappa \to \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ be a fixed inective mapping (which exists by the assumption $\kappa \leq 2^{\aleph_0}$) and let $f : \kappa \to \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ be defined by $f(\alpha) = \iota^{-1}(\langle a'(\alpha, n) : n \in \omega\rangle)$ where $a'(\alpha, n)$'s are defined by $a'(\alpha, 0) = g(\alpha)$ and $a'(\alpha, n+1) = a(\alpha, n)$. Note that $f$ is 1-1 mapping because of the clause on $a'(\alpha, 0)$. For each $i < \omega$, let

$$A_i = \begin{cases} \{\langle x_0, \ldots, x_{i-1}\rangle \in (\mathcal{P}(\omega))^i : \bigcap_{n<|t_i|} (x_n)_{t_i(n)+1} \neq \emptyset\}, & \text{if } t_i \in T; \\ (\mathcal{P}(\omega))^i, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and let $A = \dot{\bigcup}_{i\in\omega} A_i$. Since $T$ is hereditary countable and $\iota$ is definable, $A$ is also definable. Hence, for these $f$ and $A$, either (h0) or (h1) in the definition of $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$ holds.

If (h0), then there is a stationary $D \subseteq \kappa$ such that $(f\text{“}D)^{<\aleph_0} \subseteq A$. We claim that this $D$ witnesses (c0) in the definition of $C^s(\kappa)$ for these $T$ and $\langle a(\alpha, n) : \alpha < \kappa,\, n \in \omega\rangle$: for any $t \in T$ and $s \in (D)^{|t|}$, let $i \in \omega$ be such that $t = t_i$. Let $s' \in (D)^i$ be any end-extension of $s$. Since $f$ is 1-1, we have $\langle f(s'(0)), \ldots, f(s'(i-1))\rangle \in (f\text{“}D)^i$. Hence $\langle f(s'(0)), \ldots, f(s'(i-1))\rangle \in A_i$. By definition of $A_i$ this means $\bigcap_{n<|t|} a(s(n), t(n)) \neq \emptyset$.

If (h1), then there is an $i < \omega$ and stationary $D_0, \ldots, D_{i-1} \subseteq \kappa$ such that $(f\text{“}D_0, \ldots, f\text{“}D_{i-1}) \subseteq (\mathcal{P}(\omega))^i \setminus A_i$. Let $t = t_i$. Then $t \in T$ by definition of $A$ and $\bigcap_{j<|t|} a(s(j), t(j)) = \emptyset$ for every $s \in (D_0, \ldots, D_{|t|-1})$. Thus (c1) holds for these $D_0, \ldots, D_{|t|-1}$. ❑ (Lemma 3.4)

Using the trick of the proof above we can also easily obtain the following lemma which generalizes Theorem 4.1 in [4]:

**Lemma 3.5** *Suppose that* $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$. *For any sequence* $\langle x_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\rangle$ *of subsets of* $\omega$, *either there is a stationary* $D \subseteq \kappa$ *such that* $\{x_\alpha : \alpha \in D\}$ *is independent (i.e. equivalence classes of* $x_\alpha$, $\alpha \in D$ *are independent in* $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/fin$ *as a subset of the Boolean algebra); or there are* $n \in \omega$, $i : n \to 2$ *and stationary* $D_0, \ldots, D_{n-1} \subseteq \kappa$ *such that* $\bigcap_{k<n}(x_{\alpha_k})^{i(k)}$ *is finite for every* $\langle \alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{n-1}\rangle \in (D_0, \ldots, D_{n-1})$, *where we write*

$$(x)^i = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } i = 1, \\ \omega \setminus x & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

*for* $x \in \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ *and* $i \in 2$. ❑

By Lemma 3.4, every assertions provable under $C^s(\kappa)$ or $\hat{C}^s(\kappa)$ e.g. such as given in [4] are also consequences of $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$. One of such assertions is the non-existence of $\kappa$-Lusin gap for which we shall give here a direct proof from $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$.

An almost disjoint family $F \subseteq [\omega]^{\aleph_0}$ is called a *$\kappa$-Lusin gap* if, $|F| = \kappa$ and, for any $x \in [\omega]^{\aleph_0}$, at least one of $|\{y \in F : y \subseteq^* x\}| < \kappa$ or $|\{y \in F : y \subseteq^* \omega\setminus x\}| < \kappa$ holds.

**Lemma 3.6** (Juhász, Soukup and Szentmiklóssy [4] under $C(\kappa)$) *Suppose that* $\kappa$ *is a regular cardinal and* $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$ *holds. Then there is no* $\kappa$*-Lusin gap.*

**Proof** Suppose that $F \subseteq [\omega]^{\aleph_0}$ is an almost disjoint family of cardinality $\kappa$. We show that $F$ is no $\kappa$-Lusin gap. Let $f : \kappa \to F$ be an injective mapping and let

$$A = \{\langle x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}\rangle \in (\mathcal{P}(\omega))^{<\omega} : n = 1 \text{ or } (x_0 \cap x_1) \setminus n \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Then clearly (h0) in the definition of $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$ is impossible for these $f$, $A$. Hence, by $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$, there is $k \in \omega$, $k \geq 1$, and stationary $D_0, \ldots, D_{k-1} \subseteq \kappa$ such that

$(f``D_0, f``D_1, \ldots, f``D_{k-1}) \subseteq (\mathcal{P}(\omega))^k \setminus A$. By definition of $A$, this means that $(\bigcup_{\alpha\in D_0} f(\alpha)) \cap (\bigcup_{\alpha\in D_1} f(\alpha)) \subseteq k$.

Let $x = \bigcup_{\alpha\in D_0} f(\alpha)$. Then $\{f(\alpha) : \alpha \in D_0\} \subseteq \{y \in F : y \subseteq^* x\}$ and $\{f(\alpha) : \alpha \in D_1\} \subseteq \{y \in F : y \subseteq^* (\omega \setminus x)\}$. Since $f``D_0$ and $f``D_1$ are both of cardinality $\kappa$, this shows that $F$ is not a $\kappa$-Suslin gap. ❑ (Lemma 3.6)

# 4 Injectivity Principle

In this section we consider two axioms which are connected with the principles $F^s(\kappa)$ introduced in Juhász, Soukup and Szentmiklóssy [4]. For a regular cardinal $\kappa$ and $\lambda \leq \kappa$, stipulate

IP$(\kappa, \lambda)$: *For any $f : \kappa \to \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ and definable $g : (\mathcal{P}(\omega))^{<\omega} \to \mathcal{P}(\omega)$, either*

- (i0) *there is a stationary set $D \subseteq \kappa$ such that $|\, g``(f``D)^n \,| < \lambda$ for every $n \in \omega$; or*
- (i1) *there are $n \in \omega$ and stationary sets $D_0, \ldots, D_{n-1} \subseteq \kappa$ such that for any $\langle x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}\rangle$, $\langle y_0, \ldots, y_{n-1}\rangle \in (f``D_0, \ldots, f``D_{n-1})$, if $x_i \neq y_i$ for all $i < n$, then we have $g(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}) \neq g(y_0, \ldots, y_{n-1})$.*

As for HP$(\kappa)$, we may replace $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ in the definition of IP$(\kappa, \lambda)$ by one of ${}^\omega\omega$, ${}^\omega 2$, $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{R}^2$, $\cdots$. We can consider the weakenings IP$_k(\kappa, \lambda)$, $k \in \omega$ which corresponds to HP$_k(\kappa)$, $k \in \omega$ and reformulate the following lemmas according to these weakenings of IP$(\kappa, \lambda)$. Also, for the most of the following, the version of IP$(\kappa, \lambda)$ is enough which is obtained by replacing stationarity in the definition by cardinality $\kappa$.

**Lemma 4.1** *Suppose that $\kappa$ is a regular uncountable cardinal and $\lambda < \kappa$.*

(0) *If $\lambda' < \lambda$ and* IP$(\kappa, \lambda')$ *then* IP$(\kappa, \lambda)$.

(1) *If $2^{\aleph_0} < \kappa$ then* IP$(\kappa, 2)$.

(2) IP$(\kappa, \aleph_0)$ *implies $2^{\aleph_0} < \kappa$.*

(3) IP$(\aleph_2, \aleph_0)$ *is equivalent to* CH.

(4) IP$(\kappa, \kappa)$ *implies that there is no strictly increasing chain in $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ of length $\kappa$ with respect to $\subseteq^*$.*

(5) $\neg$IP$(\aleph_1, \aleph_1)$.

**Proof** (0) is clear by definition.

(1): Let $f$ and $g$ be as in the definition of IP$(\kappa, 2)$. Let $D \subseteq \kappa$ be a stationary set such that $f$ is constant on $D$. Then clearly (i0) holds for this $D$.

(2): Suppose that $2^{\aleph_0} \geq \kappa$. We show that $\mathrm{IP}(\kappa, \aleph_0)$ does not hold. Let $f : \kappa \to \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ be injective and $g : (\mathcal{P}(\omega))^{<\omega} \to \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ be defined by $g(x_0) = \emptyset$ and $g(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}) = \min\{n \in \omega : n \in x_0 \not\leftrightarrow n \in x_1\}$ for $n \geq 2$. Let $D$ be any stationary subset of $\kappa$. Then $|\, g``(f``D)^2 \,| \geq \aleph_0$: otherwise, let $k \in \omega$ be such that $g``(f``D)^2 \subseteq k$. Since $\mathcal{P}(k+1)$ is finite, there are $\alpha, \beta \in D$, $\alpha \neq \beta$ such that $f(\alpha)\restriction(k+1) = f(\beta)\restriction(k+1)$. But then, by definition of $g$, it follows that $g(f(\alpha), f(\beta)) > k$. This is a contradiction. Thus (i0) does not hold for these $f$ and $g$. On the other hand, for arbitrary stationary subsets $D_0, \ldots, D_{n-1}$ of $\kappa$, as there are only countably many values of $g$, we can easily find $\langle x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}\rangle, \langle y_0, \ldots, y_{n-1}\rangle \in (f``D_0, \ldots, f``D_{n-1})$ such that $x_i \neq y_i$ for all $i < n$ and $g(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}) = g(y_0, \ldots, y_{n-1})$. Thus neither (i1) can hold.

(3) follows from (1) and (2).

(4): Suppose that $\langle x_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\rangle$ is a strictly increasing chain in $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ with respect to $\subseteq^*$. Let $f : \kappa \to \mathcal{P}(\omega)$; $\alpha \mapsto x_\alpha$ and $g : (\mathcal{P}(\omega))^{<\omega} \to \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ be defined by $f(x_0) = \emptyset$ and $f(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}) = x_0 \setminus x_1$ for $n \geq 2$. We claim that these $f$ and $g$ are counter examples for $\mathrm{IP}(\kappa, \aleph_1)$. For arbitrary stationary subset $D$ of $\kappa$, if $\alpha_0$, $\alpha_1$, $\beta_0$, $\beta_1 \in D$ are such that $\beta_0 < \alpha_0 \leq \beta_1 < \alpha_1$, then $f(\alpha_0) \setminus f(\beta_0)$ and $f(\alpha_1) \setminus f(\beta_1)$ are two almost disjoint infinite sets. It follows that $|\, g``(f``D)^2 \,| = \kappa$. Hence (i0) does not hold for these $f$, $g$. On the other hand, if $D_0, \ldots, D_{n-1}$ are stationary, then $\{g(f(\alpha_0), \ldots, f(\alpha_{n-1})) : \langle \alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{n-1}\rangle \in (D_0, \ldots, D_{n-1}), \alpha_0 < \alpha_1\}$ is a subset of $[\omega]^{<\aleph_0}$ and hence countable. So we can find $\langle x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}\rangle, \langle y_0, \ldots, y_{n-1}\rangle \in (f``D_0, \ldots, f``D_{n-1})$ with $x_i \neq y_i$ for all $i < n$ such that $g(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}) = g(y_0, \ldots, y_{n-1})$. Thus (i1) cannot hold for these $f$, $g$.

(5): There exists a strictly increasing chain in $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$ with respect to $\subseteq^*$ of length $\omega_1$. Hence, by (4), we have $\neg\mathrm{IP}(\aleph_1, \aleph_1)$. ❑ (Lemma 4.1)

Now, similarly to the Homogeneity Principle, we define the Injectivity Principle (IP) as the assertion:

IP: $\mathrm{IP}(\kappa, \kappa)$ *holds for every regular cardinal* $\kappa \geq \aleph_2$.

A natural strengthening of IP would be the following:

IP$^+$: $\mathrm{IP}(\kappa, \aleph_1)$ *holds for every regular cardinal* $\kappa \geq \aleph_2$.

The following lemma can be now proved similarly to Lemma 3.3:

**Lemma 4.2** (1) CH *implies* IP.

(2) $\mathrm{IP}(\aleph_2, \aleph_2)$ *and hence* IP *implies* $\mathbf{b} = \aleph_1$.

(3) OCA *implies* $\neg\mathrm{IP}(\aleph_2, \aleph_2)$ *and hence* $\neg$IP.

(4) $\mathrm{IP}(\aleph_2, \aleph_2)$ *and hence* IP *implies* $\mathcal{P}(\omega_1)/$*countable is not embeddable into* $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/fin$. ❑

For a regular cardinal $\kappa$, the principle $F^s(\kappa)$ is defined in [4] by:

$F^s(\kappa)$: *For any* $T \subseteq \omega^{<\omega}$ *and any matrix* $\langle a(\alpha, n) : \alpha < \kappa, n \in \omega\rangle$ *of subsets of* $\omega$*, either*

(f0) *there is a stationary* $S \subseteq \kappa$ *such that*

$$|\{\textstyle\bigcap_{i<|t|} a(s(i), t(i)) : t \in T \text{ and } s \in (S)^{|t|}\}| \leq \aleph_0; \text{ or}$$

(f1) *there are* $t \in T$ *and stationary* $D_0, \ldots, D_{|t|-1} \subseteq \kappa$ *such that for every* $s_0, s_1 \in (D_0, \ldots, D_{|t|-1})$*, if* $s_0(i) \neq s_1(i)$ *for all* $i < |t|$*, then* $\bigcap_{i<|t|} a(s_0(i), t(i)) \neq \bigcap_{i<|t|} a(s_1(i), t(i))$.

Using the trick of the proof of Lemma 3.4, the following is readily seen:

**Lemma 4.3** $\mathrm{IP}(\kappa, \aleph_1)$ *implies* $F^s(\kappa)$*. Thus* $\mathrm{IP}^+$ *implies* $F^s(\kappa)$ *for every regular* $\kappa \geq \aleph_2$. □

# 5 Nice side-by-side products

In Juhász, Soukup and Szentmiklóssy [4], it is proved that, if $\kappa$ is an $\aleph_0$-inaccessible cardinal in the ground model (for definition see below), then $C^s(\kappa)$, $\hat{C}^s(\kappa)$ and $F^s(\kappa)$ still hold in the model obtained by adding arbitrary number of Cohen reals. Practically the same proof also shows that $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$ and $\mathrm{IP}(\kappa)$ hold in such a model. Analyzing this proof, it is easily seen that the idea of the proof works not only for the partial orderings of the form $\mathrm{Fn}(\lambda, 2)$ in the case of Cohen models but also for a much broader class of partial orderings.

To formulate this fact in a general form, we introduce the following class of partial orderings: for a cardinal $\kappa$ and a partial ordering $Q$, we call a partial ordering $P$ a *nice side-by-side $\kappa$-product of $Q$* if there are suborderings $Q_\alpha$, $\alpha < \kappa$ of $P$, order-isomorphisms $\iota_\alpha : Q \to Q_\alpha$ and order preserving "projections" $\pi_\alpha : P \to P_\alpha$ for all $\alpha < \kappa$ with the following properties (n1) – (n4):

(n1) For every $p \in P$ $\{\alpha < \kappa : \pi_\alpha(p) \neq \mathbb{1}_P\}$ is countable and $p = \inf\{\pi_\alpha(p) : \alpha < \kappa\}$. We denote with $\mathrm{supp}(p)$ the countable set $\{\alpha < \kappa : \pi_\alpha(p) \neq \mathbb{1}_P\}$.

(n2) For any $p \in P$ and $X \subseteq \kappa$, $\inf\{\pi_\alpha(p) : \alpha \in X\}$ exists and $\mathrm{supp}(p{\restriction}X) \subseteq X$. We denote this element of $P$ with $p{\restriction}X$.

(n3) For $X \subseteq \kappa$, let $P_X = \{p \in P : \mathrm{supp}(p) \subseteq X\}$. Then the mapping $P_X \times P_{\kappa\setminus X} \ni \langle p, q\rangle \mapsto \inf\{p, q\} \in P$ is well-defined and is an order-isomorphism.

(n4) Every bijection $j : \kappa \to \kappa$ induces an automorphism $\tilde{j} : P \to P$ such that $\tilde{j}{\restriction}Q_\alpha = \iota_{j(\alpha)} \circ \iota_\alpha^{-1}$.

Note that the usual finite and countable support side-by-side product of $Q$ as well as $\Pi^*_\kappa Q$ satisfy the conditions above. Also, note that the Cohen forcing $\mathrm{Fn}(\kappa, 2)$ is isomorphic to the finite support $\kappa$-product of $\mathrm{Fn}(\omega, 2)$.

**Lemma 5.1** *Suppose that $P$ is a nice side-by-side $\kappa$ product of a partial ordering $Q$ and $X \subseteq P$. Then, for any $p$, $q \in P$:*

(0) *$P_X$ is a regular subordering of $P$.*

(1) *The mapping $P \ni p \mapsto \langle p{\restriction} X, p{\restriction}(\kappa \setminus X)\rangle \in P_X \times P_{\kappa\setminus X}$ is the reverse mapping of the isomorphism given in* (n3)*. In particular, if $p \leq q$, then $p{\restriction} X \leq q{\restriction} X$.*

(2) *If $X = \mathrm{supp}(p) \cap \mathrm{supp}(q)$ and $p{\restriction} X \leq q{\restriction} X$, then $r = \inf\{p(\alpha), q(\alpha) : \alpha \in \kappa\}$ exists. We shall write $p \wedge q$ to denote such $r$.*

(3) *Let $\lambda = |X|$. Then $P_X$ is a nice side-by-side $\lambda$-product of $Q$.*

**Proof** (0), (1) and (2) follows immediately from (n2) and (n3). For (3), enumerate $Q_\alpha$, $\alpha \in X$ by $\lambda$, say as $\langle Q'_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$. Then it is easy to see that this sequence witnesses that $P{\restriction} X$ is a nice side-by-side $\lambda$-product of $Q$. ❑ (Lemma 5.1)

In [4], a cardinal number $\kappa$ is called $\lambda$-inaccessible if $\kappa$ is regular and $\mu^\lambda < \kappa$ for every $\mu < \kappa$. Under GCH, every regular cardinal $\kappa \geq \aleph_2$ is $\aleph_0$-inaccessible provided that $\kappa$ is not a successor of a cardinal of cofinality $\omega$.

**Theorem 5.2** *Let $\kappa$ be an $\aleph_0$-inaccessible cardinal. Suppose that $P$ is a proper nice side-by-side $\kappa$-product of a partial ordering $Q$ such that $|Q| < \kappa$. Then $\Vdash_P$ "$\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$".*

Toward the proof of Theorem 5.2, we prove first the following lemmas.

For a partial ordering $P$, a $P$-name $\dot{x}$ of a subset of $\omega$ is called a *nice $P$-name* if there is an antichain $A^{\dot{x}}_n$ in $P$ for each $n \in \omega$ such that $\dot{x} = \bigcup_{n\in\omega}\{\langle p, \check{n}\rangle : p \in A^{\dot{x}}_n\}$. It is easy to see that, for each $P$-name $\dot{x}$ of a subset of $\omega$, there is a nice $P$-name $\dot{x}'$ such that $\Vdash_P$ "$\dot{x} = \dot{x}'$". We say that a nice $P$-name $\dot{x}$ is *slim* if each $A^{\dot{x}}_n$ as above is countable. If $\dot{x}$ is a nice $P$-name of a subset of $\omega$ with $A^{\dot{x}}_n$, $n \in \omega$ as above and $P$ is a nice side-by-side $\kappa$-product of $Q$ for some $\kappa$ and $Q$, then we define $\mathrm{supp}(\dot{x}) = \bigcup\{\mathrm{supp}(p) : p \in A^{\dot{x}}_n \text{ for some } n \in \omega\}$. Note that, if $\dot{x}$ is slim, then $\mathrm{supp}(\dot{x})$ is countable. An automorphism $\tilde{j}$ of $P$ induces canonically a bijective class function on $P$-names which is denoted also by $\tilde{j}$. For a nice $P$-name $\dot{x}$, this function maps $\dot{x}$ to $\tilde{j}(\dot{x}) = \{\langle\tilde{j}(p), \check{n}\rangle : \langle p, \check{n}\rangle \in \dot{x}\}$.

**Lemma 5.3** *If $P$ is proper and $p \in P$ then, for any name $\dot{x}$ of a subset of $\omega$, there are $q \leq p$ and a slim $P$-name $\dot{x}'$ such that $q \Vdash_P$ "$\dot{x} = \dot{x}'$".*

**Proof** By the remark above we may assume without loss of generality that $\dot{x}$ is a nice $P$-name. Let $A^{\dot{x}}_n$, $n \in \omega$ be as above and $\dot{y}$ be a $P$-name such that $\Vdash_P$ "$\dot{y} = \{s \in P : s \in (\bigcup_{n\in\omega} A^{\dot{x}}_n) \cap \dot{G}\}$". Then we have $\Vdash_P$ "$\dot{y}$ is a countable subset of $P$". As $P$ is proper there exist $q \leq p$ and countable $y \subseteq P$ such that $q \Vdash_P$ "$\dot{y} \subseteq y$". Let $\dot{x}' = \bigcup_{n\in\omega}\{\langle s, \check{n}\rangle : s \in A^{\dot{x}}_n \cap y\}$. It is then easy to see that these $q$ and $\dot{x}'$ are as desired. ❑ (Lemma 5.3)

**Lemma 5.4** *Suppose that $\kappa$ is $\aleph_0$-inaccessible and $P$ is a nice side-by-side $\kappa$-product of a partial ordering $Q$ with $|\,Q\,| < \kappa$. If $S \subseteq \{\alpha < \kappa : \mathrm{cof}(\alpha) > \omega\}$ is stationary and $\langle \dot{x}_\alpha : \alpha \in S\rangle$ is a sequence of $P$-names of subsets of $\omega$, then for any $p \in P$ there are a stationary $S^* \subseteq S$, a sequence $\langle \dot{x}'_\alpha : \alpha \in S^*\rangle$ of slim $P$-names and a sequence $\langle p_\alpha : \alpha \in S^*\rangle$ of elements of $P$ such that*

(a) *$p_\alpha \leq p$ and $p_\alpha \Vdash_P$ "$\dot{x}_\alpha = \dot{x}'_\alpha$" for every $\alpha \in S^*$;*

(b) *$d_\alpha = \mathrm{supp}(p_\alpha) \cup \mathrm{supp}(\dot{x}'_\alpha)$, $\alpha \in S^*$ are all of the same cardinality and form a $\Delta$-system with a root $r$;*

(c) *for each $\alpha$, $\beta \in S^*$, there is a bijection $j_{\alpha,\beta}$ on $\kappa$ such that $j_{\alpha,\beta}\restriction r = id_r$, $j_{\alpha,\beta}$"$d_\alpha = d_\beta$, $\tilde{j}_{\alpha,\beta}(p_\alpha) = p_\beta$ and $\tilde{j}_{\alpha,\beta}(\dot{x}'_\alpha) = \dot{x}'_\beta$, where $\tilde{j}_{\alpha,\beta}$ is the automorphism on $P$ induced from $j_{\alpha,\beta}$ (and the class function on $P$-names induced from this).*

**Proof** By Lemma 5.3, there are a sequence $\langle p_\alpha : \alpha \in S\rangle$ of elements of $P$ below $p$ and a sequence $\langle \dot{x}'_\alpha : \alpha \in S\rangle$ of slim $P$-names such that $p_\alpha \Vdash_P$ "$\dot{x}_\alpha = \dot{x}'_\alpha$" for every $\alpha \in S$. Let $d_\alpha = \mathrm{supp}(p_\alpha) \cup \mathrm{supp}(\dot{x}'_\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in S$. Since each $d_\alpha$ is countable and $\kappa$ is $\aleph_0$-inaccessible, we can apply Erdős-Rado Theorem 2.1 to these $d_\alpha$'s and obtain a stationary $S' \subseteq S$ such that $d_\alpha$, $\alpha \in S'$ form a $\Delta$-system with a root $r$. We may assume further that $d_\alpha \setminus r$, $\alpha \in S'$ have all the same cardinality ($\leq \aleph_0$). For a fixed $\alpha_0 \in S'$ and each $\alpha \in S'$ let $j_\alpha : \kappa \to \kappa$ be a bijection such that $j_\alpha\restriction r = id_r$ and $j_\alpha$"$d_\alpha = d_{\alpha_0}$. As before, we call the class mapping on $P$-names induced from $\tilde{j}_\alpha$ also $\tilde{j}_\alpha$ for simplicity. Now, by $|\,Q\,| < \kappa$ and $\aleph_0$-naccessibility of $\kappa$, we have $|\,Q\,|^{\aleph_0} < \kappa$. Hence there are only $< \kappa$ many possibilities of $\tilde{j}_{\alpha,\alpha_0}(p_\alpha)$ and $\tilde{j}_{\alpha,\alpha_0}(\dot{x}'_\alpha)$. So we can find a stationary $S^* \subseteq S'$ such that $\tilde{j}_{\alpha,\alpha_0}(p_\alpha)$, $\alpha \in S^*$ are all the same and also $\tilde{j}_{\alpha,\alpha_0}(\dot{x}'_\alpha)$, $\alpha \in S^*$ are all the same. For $\alpha$, $\beta \in S^*$, it is readily seen that $j_{\alpha,\beta} = j_\beta \circ (j_\alpha)^{-1}$ satisfies (c) above. Hence $S^*$, $\langle p_\alpha : \alpha \in S^*\rangle$ and $\langle \dot{x}'_\alpha : \alpha \in S^*\rangle$ are as required. ❑ (Lemma 5.4)

**Lemma 5.5** *Suppose that $P$ is a nice side-by-side $\kappa$-product of a partial ordering $Q$. Then $P$ has the precaliber $(|\,Q\,|^{\aleph_0})^+$. In particular $P$ is productively $(|\,Q\,|^{\aleph_0})^+$-cc.*

**Proof** Let $\lambda = (|\,Q\,|^{\aleph_0})^+$ and suppose that $\{p_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\} \subseteq P$. By Theorem 2.1, there is $X \in [\lambda]^\lambda$ such that $\mathrm{supp}(p_\alpha)$, $\alpha \in X$ form a $\Delta$-system with a root $r$. Since $|\,Q\,|^{\aleph_0} < \lambda$, we may assume that $p_\alpha{\restriction} r$, $\alpha \in X$ are all the same. Hence by Lemma 5.1, (2), $p_\alpha$ and $p_\beta$ are compatible for every $\alpha$, $\beta \in X$. ❑ (Lemma 5.5)

**Lemma 5.6** *Suppose that $\kappa$ is $\aleph_0$-inaccessible. If $P$ is a proper nice side-by-side $\kappa$-product of a partial ordering $Q$ with $|\,Q\,| < \kappa$, then for any sequence $\langle p_\alpha : \alpha \in S\rangle$ of elements of $P$ for a stationary $S \subseteq \{\alpha < \kappa : \mathrm{cof}(\alpha) > \omega\}$, we have $p \Vdash_P$ "$\{\alpha \in S : p_\alpha \in \dot{G}\}$ is stationary subset of $\kappa$" for some $p \in P$. Further, if $\{p_\alpha : \alpha \in S\}$ is such that $\mathrm{supp}(p_\alpha)$, $\alpha \in S$ form a $\Delta$-system with the root $r$ and $p_\alpha{\restriction} r$ are all the same for $\alpha \in S$. Then $p_\alpha{\restriction} r$ for $\alpha \in S$ can be taken as the $p$ above.*

**Proof** By the same argument as the proof of Lemma 5.4, it is seen that we may suppose that the condition in the last assertion holds: thus $\langle \mathrm{supp}(p_\alpha) : \alpha \in S\rangle$ forms a $\Delta$-system with the root $r$ and $p_\alpha{\restriction} r = p$ for all $\alpha \in S$. We may also assume that $\min(\mathrm{supp}(p_\alpha) \setminus r) \geq \alpha$ for every $\alpha \in S$: otherwise, by Fodor's lemma and $|\,Q\,|^{\aleph_0} < \kappa$, we can find easily a stationary $S^* \subseteq S$ such that $p_\alpha$, $\alpha \in S^*$ are all the same. Let $q \leq p$ be arbitrary and $\dot{C}$ be a $P$-name such that $\Vdash_P$ "$\dot{C}$ is a club subset of $\kappa$". We have to show that there is some $q' \leq q$ such that $q' \Vdash_P$ "$\dot{C} \cap \dot{S} \neq \emptyset$" where $\dot{S}$ is a $P$-name for $\{\alpha \in S : p_\alpha \in \dot{G}\}$. Let $\chi$ be sufficiently large. Since $P$ has the $\kappa$-cc by Lemma 5.5, there is an $M \prec \mathcal{H}(\chi)$ such that $P, Q, \langle p_\alpha : \alpha \in S\rangle, q \in M$; $M \cap \kappa = \alpha^* \in S$; $\mathrm{supp}(q) \subseteq \alpha^*$; $\Vdash_P$ "$\min(\dot{C} \setminus \alpha < \alpha^*)$" and $\mathrm{supp}(p_\alpha) \subseteq \alpha^*$ for every $\alpha < \alpha^*$. Then it follows that $\Vdash_P$ "$\alpha^* \in \dot{C}$". Hence $p_{\alpha^*} \Vdash_P$ "$\alpha^* \in \dot{C} \cap \dot{S}$". We have $\mathrm{supp}(q) \cap \mathrm{supp}(p_{\alpha^*}) = r$ and $q{\restriction} r \leq p_{\alpha*}{\restriction} r$. Hence $p_{\alpha^*}$ and $q$ are compatible by Lemma 5.1, (2). Let $q' \leq p_{\alpha^*}$, $q$. Then $q' \Vdash_P$ "$\dot{C} \cap \dot{S} \neq \emptyset$". ❑ (Lemma 5.6)

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 5.2:

**Proof of Theorem 5.2:** Let $G$ be a $P$-generic filter over our ground model $V$. To show $V[G] \models \mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$, let $f$, $A \in V[G]$ be such that $f : \kappa \to \mathcal{P}(\omega)^{V[G]}$ and $A \subseteq ((\mathcal{P}(\omega))^{<\aleph_0})^{V[G]}$ is definable. Since $P$ is proper, $\omega_1$ in the ground model is preserved. Hence the hereditarily countable parameters in a defining formula $\varphi$ for $A$ can be coded in a subset $a$ of $\omega$ in the way that these parameters can be recovered uniformly from $a$ and some ground model sets. Hence, by modifying $a$ so that it codes every thing needed, we may assume that $\varphi$ contains $a$ as the single parameter.

Let $\dot{f}$, $\dot{a}$ and $\dot{A}$ be $P$-names of $f$, $a$ and $A$ respectively such that $\Vdash_P$ "$\dot{f} : \kappa \to \mathcal{P}(\omega)$" and

$$\Vdash_P \text{"}\forall x \in (\mathcal{P}(\omega))^{<\aleph_0}(x \in \dot{A} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{H}(\aleph_1) \models \varphi[x, \dot{a}])\text{"}.$$

Suppose now that, for $p \in P$,

$$p \Vdash_P \text{"(h0) in the definition of HP}(\kappa) \text{ does not hold for } \dot{f} \text{ and } \dot{A}\text{"}.$$

We have to show that $p$ forces the assertion corresponding to (h1) in the definition of $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$. To do this, let $p' \leq p$ be arbitrary and we show that there is $q' \leq p'$ forcing (h1). By Lemma 5.3, there are $p'' \leq p'$ and a slim nice $P$-name $\dot{a}'$ such that $p'' \Vdash_P$ "$\dot{a} = \dot{a}'$". By Lemma 5.4, there are a stationary $S^* \subseteq \{\alpha < \kappa : \mathrm{cof}(\alpha) > \omega\}$, a sequence $\langle \dot{x}'_\alpha : \alpha \in S^* \rangle$ of slim nice $P$-names and a sequence $\langle p_\alpha : \alpha \in S^* \rangle$ of conditions in $P$ such that

(a) $p_\alpha \leq p''$ and $p_\alpha \Vdash_P$ "$\dot{f}(\alpha) = \dot{x}'_\alpha$" for every $\alpha \in S^*$;

(b) $d_\alpha = \mathrm{supp}(p_\alpha) \cup \mathrm{supp}(\dot{x}'_\alpha)$, $\alpha \in S^*$ are all of the same cardinality and form a $\Delta$-system with the root $r$. $d_\alpha \cap \mathrm{supp}(\dot{a}') \subseteq r$;

(c) For each $\alpha$, $\beta \in S^*$ there is a bijection $j_{\alpha,\beta} : \kappa \to \kappa$ such that $j_{\alpha,\beta} \restriction r = id_r$, $j_{\alpha,\beta}$"$d_\alpha = d_\beta$, $\tilde{j}_{\alpha,\beta}(p_\alpha) = p_\beta$ and $\tilde{j}_{\alpha,\beta}(\dot{x}'_\alpha) = \dot{x}'_\beta$ for every $\alpha$, $\beta \in S^*$, where $\tilde{j}_{\alpha,\beta}$ is as in Lemma 5.4.

Note that, by the last sentence of (b), the mapping $j_{\alpha,\beta}$ can be chosen so that $\tilde{j}_{\alpha,\beta}(\dot{a}') = \dot{a}'$. Let $q = p_\alpha \restriction r$ for some/any $\alpha \in S^*$. By the inequality in (a) and since $r$ is the root of $d_\alpha$'s, we have $q \leq p''$

Let $\dot{S}$ be a $P$ name such that $\Vdash_P$ "$\dot{S} = \{\alpha \in S^* : p_\alpha \in \dot{G}\}$". By Lemma 5.6

(d) $q \Vdash_P$ "$\dot{S}$ is stationary".

Hence, by assumption, we have

$$q \Vdash_P \text{“}\exists n \in \omega(\dot{f}\text{“}(\dot{S})^n \not\subseteq \dot{A})\text{”}.$$

Let $q' \leq q$ pin down the $n$ above as $n^* \in \omega$ and an example showing "$\dot{f}$"$(\dot{S})^n \not\subseteq \dot{A}$" as:

$$(*) \qquad q' \Vdash_P \text{“}\alpha^*_0, \ldots, \alpha^*_{n^*-1} \in \dot{S} \ \wedge \bigwedge_{i<j<n^*} \dot{f}(\alpha^*_i) \neq \dot{f}(\alpha^*_j) \wedge \ \mathcal{H}(\aleph_1) \models \neg\varphi[\langle \dot{f}(\alpha^*_0), \ldots, \dot{f}(\alpha^*_{n^*-1})\rangle, \dot{a}]\text{”}$$

for $\alpha^*_0, \ldots, \alpha^*_{n^*-1} \in S^*$. By definition of $\dot{S}$, $p_{\alpha^*_0}, \ldots, p_{\alpha^*_{n-1}}$ together with $q'$ build a sentered set. Hence by modifying $q'$, if necessary, we may assume that $q' \leq p_{\alpha^*_k}$ for every $k < n^*$. Let $S^{**} = \{\alpha \in S^* : \mathrm{supp}(q') \cap \mathrm{supp}(p_\alpha) \subseteq r\}$. Then $S^{**}$ is still stationary subset of $\kappa$. For $k < n^*$ and $\alpha \in S^{**}$, let $j_{k,\alpha} : \kappa \to \kappa$ be a bijection such that $j_{k,\alpha}$ only moves points from $(d_{\alpha^*_k} \cup d_\alpha) \setminus r$ ; $\tilde{j}_{k,\alpha}(p_{\alpha^*_k}) = p_\alpha$ ; and $\tilde{j}_{k,\alpha}(\dot{x}'_{\alpha^*_k}) = \dot{x}'_\alpha$. Here again $\tilde{j}_{k,\kappa}$ denotes the automorphism on $P$ induced by $j_{k,\kappa}$ and the corresponding class mapping on $P$-names.

Let $q^k_\alpha = \tilde{j}_{k,\alpha}(q')$ for $k < n^*$ and $\alpha \in S^{**}$. Then $q^k_\alpha \leq q_\alpha$ for every $\alpha \in S^{**}$. Again by Lemma 5.6,

$$q \Vdash_P \text{“}\{\alpha \in S^{**} : q^k_\alpha \in \dot{G}\} \text{ is stationary for every } k < n^*\text{”}.$$

For $k < n^*$, let $\dot{D}_k$ be a $P$-name such that

$$\Vdash_P \text{“ } \dot{D}_k = \{\alpha \in S^* \,:\, q^k_\alpha \in \dot{G}\} \text{ ”}.$$

We claim that

$$q' \Vdash_P \text{“ } \mathcal{H}(\aleph_1) \models \neg\varphi[\langle \dot{f}(\alpha_0), \dots, \dot{f}(\alpha_{n^*-1})\rangle, \dot{a}] \\ \text{for every } (\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{n^*-1}) \in (\dot{D}_0, \dots, \dot{D}_{n^*-1}) \text{ ”}.$$

Suppose $q'' \leq q'$ and $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{n^*-1} \in \kappa$ be such that

$$q'' \Vdash_P \text{“ } (\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{n^*-1}) \in (\dot{D}_0, \dots, \dot{D}_{n^*-1}) \text{ ”}.$$

Then by definition of $\dot{D}_0, \dots, \dot{D}_{n^*-1}$, we have $q'' \Vdash_P \text{“ } q^0_{\alpha_0}, \dots, q^{n^*-1}_{\alpha_{n^*-1}} \in \dot{G} \text{ ”}$. Hence, letting $j = j_{0,\alpha_0} \circ \cdots \circ j_{n^*-1,\alpha_{n^*-1}}$ and $\tilde{j}$ the corresponding mapping, we have $q'' \Vdash_P \text{“ } \tilde{j}(q') \in \dot{G} \text{ ”}$. Let $q''' \leq q''$, $\tilde{j}(q')$. By $(*)$, we have

$$\tilde{j}(q') \Vdash_P \text{“ } \mathcal{H}(\aleph_1) \models \neg\varphi[\langle \tilde{j}(\dot{f}(\alpha^*_0)), \dots, \tilde{j}(\dot{f}(\alpha^*_{n^*-1}))\rangle, \tilde{j}(\dot{a})] \text{ ”}.$$

Since $q'' \Vdash_P \text{“ } \tilde{j}(\dot{f}(\alpha^*_i)) = \tilde{j}(\dot{x}'_{\alpha^*_i}) = \dot{x}'_{\alpha_i} = \dot{f}(\alpha_i) \text{ ”}$ for $i < n^*$ and $\tilde{j}(\dot{a}) = \dot{a}$, it follows that

$$q''' \Vdash_P \text{“ } \mathcal{H}(\aleph_1) \models \neg\varphi[\langle \dot{f}(\alpha_0), \dots, \dot{f}(\alpha_{n^*-1})\rangle, \dot{a}] \text{ ”}.$$

❑ (Theorem 5.2)

In the proof of Theorem 5.2, the definability was not needed in the form we introduced it in section 2. What was needed here was merely that $A$ can be “defined” in some sense from some hereditarily countable parameters. E.g., let $\mathrm{HP}^\dagger(\kappa)$ be the principle obtained from $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$ by replacing the definability by the definability by second order property in $(\mathcal{H}(\aleph_1), \in)$. Then Theorem 5.2 with $\mathrm{HP}^\dagger(\kappa)$ in place of $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$ still holds. By the argument in the proof of Lemma 3.1, (4), this shows that the reals have no second order definable well-ordering in the resulting models. C.f. [1], where a model of Martin's Axiom is given in which there is a $\Delta^2_1$-definable well-ordering of reals.

Our next goal is the following generalization of Theorem 5.2:

**Theorem 5.7** *Assume that* CH *holds. Then, for any regular cardinal $\kappa$ and any proper nice side-by-side $\kappa$-product of a partial ordering $Q$ of cardinality $\leq 2^{\aleph_0}$, we have $\Vdash_P \text{“ HP}(\lambda) \text{ ”}$ for every $\aleph_0$-inaccessible $\lambda$. In particular, if $\aleph_2 \leq \kappa < \aleph_\omega$ then we have $\Vdash_P \text{“ HP ”}$.*

**Corollary 5.8**

(a) $\mathrm{MA}(\textit{countable}) + (\clubsuit) + \mathrm{HP} + 2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_n$ *is consistent relative to* ZFC *for any $n \in \omega$, $n \geq 1$.*

(b) $\mathrm{MA}(\textit{Cohen}) + \mathrm{HP} + 2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_n$ *is consistent relative to* ZFC *for any $n \in \omega$, $n \geq 1$.*

**Proof** For $n = 1$ the assertions are clear. Suppose $n > 1$.

For (a), start from a model of CH and force with $\Pi^*_{\aleph_n} \mathrm{Fn}(\omega, 2)$. Then the generic extension satisfies $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_n$, ($\clubsuit$) and MA(*countable*) by Lemma 2.2. By Theorem 5.7, this model also satisfies HP.

For (b), force with $\mathrm{Fn}(\aleph_n, 2)$ over a model of CH. ❑ (Corollary 5.8)

In contrast to Martin's axiom, HP does not imply $2^{\aleph_0} = 2^{\aleph_1}$: in the combinations of axioms in Corollary 5.8, we may also require additionally that $2^{\aleph_0} < 2^{\aleph_1}$; a model can be obtained if we start from a ground model with sufficiently large $2^{\aleph_1}$.

Prior to the proof of the theorem, we show the following lemmas which should be a sort of folklore.

We shall call a $P$-name $\dot{x}$ *hereditarily $\lambda$-slim* if $|\{\dot{y}, p : \langle \dot{y}, p\rangle \in tcl(\dot{x})\}| < \lambda$, where $tcl(\dot{x})$ is the transitive closure of the set $\dot{x}$.

**Lemma 5.9** *Suppose that $\lambda$ is a regular cardinal, $P$ a $\lambda$-cc partial ordering and $\chi$ a sufficiently large regular cardinal. If $M \prec \mathcal{H}(\chi)$ is such that $P, \lambda + 1 \in M$ and $[M]^{<\lambda} \subseteq M$, then:*

(1) *$P \cap M$ is a regular subordering of $P$.*

(2) *For any $P$-name $\dot{x}$, there is a hereditarily $\lambda$-slim $P$-name $\dot{y}$ such that $\Vdash_P$ "$\dot{x} \in \mathcal{H}(\lambda) \to \dot{x} = \dot{y}$".*

(3) *If $\dot{x} \in M$ is a hereditarily $\lambda$-slim $P$-name, then $\dot{x}$ is a $P \cap M$-name.*

(4) *If $\dot{x}$ is a hereditarily $\lambda$-slim $P \cap M$-name then $x \in M$.*

(5) *If $p \in P \cap M$, $\varphi$ is a first-order formula in the language of set-theory and $\dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}$ are hereditarily $\lambda$-slim $P$-names in $M$ such that*

$$\Vdash_P \text{"}\dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1} \in \mathcal{H}(\lambda)\text{"}$$

*then we have*

$$(*) \qquad p \Vdash_P \text{"}\mathcal{H}(\lambda) \models \varphi[\dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}]\text{"} \;\Leftrightarrow\; p \Vdash_{P\cap M} \text{"}\mathcal{H}(\lambda) \models \varphi[\dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}]\text{"}.$$

(6) *If $G$ is a $P$-generic filter and $G_M = G \cap M$ then $G_M$ is a $P \cap M$-generic filter and*

$$V[G] \models \mathcal{H}(\lambda)^{V[G_M]} \prec \mathcal{H}(\lambda).$$

**Proof** (1): Let $A \subseteq P \cap M$ be a maximal antichain. By the $\lambda$-cc of $P$, we have $|A| < \lambda$. By assumption on $M$ it follows that $A \in M$. Since $M \models$ "$A$ is a maximal antichain in $P$", $A$ is really a maximal antichain in $P$ by elementarity.

(2) We show this by induction on $rnk(\dot{x})$. Let $\dot{x}$ be a $P$-name and assume that we have shown the assertion for every $P$-name with rank lower than that of $\dot{x}$. Let $\dot{x} = \{\langle \dot{x}_\alpha, p_\alpha\rangle : \alpha < \kappa\}$ for some cardinal $\kappa$. By assumption there are hereditarily

$\lambda$-slim $P$-names $\dot{x}'_\alpha$ for $\alpha < \kappa$ such that $\|\!\vdash_P$ "$\dot{x}_\alpha \in \mathcal{H}(\lambda) \to \dot{x}_\alpha = \dot{x}'_\alpha$". By the $\lambda$-cc of $P$, there are $\mu < \lambda$ and a $P$-name $\dot{f}$ such that

$$\|\!\vdash_P \text{"}\dot{f} : \mu \to \dot{x} \wedge (\dot{x} \in \mathcal{H}(\lambda) \to \dot{f} \text{ is onto)"}.$$

For each $\beta < \mu$, let $D_\beta \subseteq P$ be a maximal antichain such that for every $r \in D_\beta$ there is $\alpha_{r,\beta} < \kappa$ such that $r \|\!\vdash_P$ "$p_{\alpha_{r,\beta}} \in \dot{G}$" and $r \|\!\vdash_P$ "$\dot{f}(\beta) = \dot{x}'_{\alpha_{r,\beta}}$". By the $\lambda$-c.c. of $P$, we have $|\, D_\beta \,| < \lambda$. Let

$$\dot{y} = \{\langle \dot{x}'_{\alpha_{r,\beta}}, p_{\alpha_{r,\beta}} \rangle \,:\, r \in D_\beta \text{ for some } \beta < \mu\}.$$

Then $\dot{y}$ is as desired.

(3): Suppose that $\dot{x} \in M$ is a hereditarily $\lambda$-slim $P$-name. Then $U = \{p \in P : \langle \dot{y}, p\rangle \in tcl(\dot{x})\}$ is an element of $M$ and of cardinality $< \lambda$. Hence $U \subseteq P \cap M$ by assumption on $M$. It follows that $\dot{x}$ is a $P \cap M$-name.

(4): By induction on $rnk(\dot{x})$. Suppose that $\dot{x}$ is a hereditarily $\lambda$-slim $P \cap M$-name. Say $\dot{x} = \{\langle \dot{x}_\alpha, p_\alpha\rangle \,:\, \alpha < \mu\}$ for some $\mu < \lambda$. By induction hypothesis and since each $\dot{x}_\alpha$ is also hereditarily $\lambda$-slim, we have $\dot{x} \subseteq M$. Hence by $|\, \dot{x} \,| \leq \mu < \lambda$ and by assumption on $M$ it follows that $\dot{x} \in M$.

(5): We show this by induction on $\varphi$. If $\varphi$ is atomic, then the equivalence $(*)$ clearly holds. The induction steps for $\neg$, $\wedge$, $\vee$ are also clear. Assume that $\varphi = \exists x \psi(x, x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ and $(*)$ holds for $\psi$. Suppose first that

$$p \|\!\vdash_P \text{"}\mathcal{H}(\lambda) \models \varphi[\dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}]\text{"}.$$

Since $p$, $\lambda$, $\dot{x}_0$,..., $\dot{x}_{n-1} \in M$,

$$M \models p \|\!\vdash_P \text{"}\mathcal{H}(\lambda) \models \varphi[\dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}]\text{"}$$

by elementarity of $M$. Hence there is a $P$-name $\dot{x} \in M$ such that

$$M \models p \|\!\vdash_P \text{"}\mathcal{H}(\lambda) \models \psi[\dot{x}, \dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}]\text{"}.$$

Hence

$$p \|\!\vdash_P \text{"}\mathcal{H}(\lambda) \models \psi[\dot{x}, \dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}]\text{"}.$$

By (2), we may assume that $\dot{x}$ is a hereditarily $\lambda$-slim $P$-name. Then, by (3), $\dot{x}$ is a $P \cap M$-name. By induction hypothesis, it follows that

$$p \|\!\vdash_{P\cap M} \text{"}\mathcal{H}(\lambda) \models \psi[\dot{x}, \dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}]\text{"}$$

and hence $p \|\!\vdash_{P\cap M}$ "$\mathcal{H}(\lambda) \models \varphi[\dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}]$".

Suppose now that

$$p \|\!\vdash_{P\cap M} \text{"}\mathcal{H}(\chi) \models \varphi[\dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}]\text{"}.$$

Then, by (2), there is a hereditarily $\lambda$-slim $P \cap M$-name $\dot{x}$ such that

$$p \Vdash_{P \cap M} \text{“} \mathcal{H}(\lambda) \models \psi[\dot{x}, \dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}] \text{”}.$$

By (4), $\dot{x} \in M$. Hence by induction hypothesis

$$p \Vdash_P \text{“} \mathcal{H}(\lambda) \models \psi[\dot{x}, \dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}] \text{”}.$$

Thus we have $p \Vdash_P \text{“} \mathcal{H}(\lambda) \models \varphi[\dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}] \text{”}$.

(6): $G_M$ is a $P \cap M$-generic filter by (1). The rest of the assertion follows immediately from (5). ❑ (Lemma 5.9)

For nice side-by-side products, (5) and (6) of the lemma above can be still slightly improved. If $P$ is a nice side-by-side $\kappa$-product of some $Q$ and $\dot{x}$ is a $P$-name, let $\mathrm{supp}(\dot{x}) = \bigcup\{\mathrm{supp}(p) : \langle \dot{y}, p\rangle \in tcl(\dot{x}) \text{ for some } \dot{y}\}$. Note that, if $\mathrm{supp}(\dot{x}) \subseteq X$ for $X \subseteq \kappa$, then $\dot{x}$ is a $P_X$ name where $P_X$ is defined as in (n4) in the definition of nice side-by-side product.

**Lemma 5.10** *Suppose that $P$ is a nice side-by-side $\kappa$-product of a partial ordering $Q$ with $Q_\alpha$ and $\iota_\alpha$ for $\alpha < \kappa$ as in the definition of nice side-by-side product. For a regular cardinal $\lambda > |\,Q\,|^{\aleph_0}$ and $X \in [\kappa]^\lambda$, let $P_X$ be the regular subordering of $P$ as defined in* (n3)*. Then:*

(1) *For any $p \in P_X$, first-order formula $\varphi$ in the language of set-theory and hereditarily $\lambda$-slim $P_X$-names $\dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}$*

$$(**) \qquad p \Vdash_P \text{“} \mathcal{H}(\lambda) \models \varphi[\dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}] \text{”} \;\Leftrightarrow\; p \Vdash_{P_X} \text{“} \mathcal{H}(\lambda) \models \varphi[\dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}] \text{”}.$$

(2) *If $G$ is a $P$-generic filter and $G_X = G \cap P_X$ then*

$$V[G] \models \mathcal{H}(\lambda)^{V[G_X]} \prec \mathcal{H}(\lambda).$$

**Proof** (1): By induction on $\varphi$. If $\varphi$ is atomic, $(**)$ clearly holds. The induction steps for $\neg$, $\wedge$, $\vee$ are easy. Assume that $\varphi$ is $\exists x \psi(x, x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ and we have proved $(**)$ for $\psi$. First, suppose that we have

$$p \Vdash_P \text{“} \mathcal{H}(\lambda) \models \varphi[\dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}] \text{”}.$$

$P$ has the $(|\,Q\,|^{\aleph_0})^+$-cc by Lemma 5.5. Hence, by Lemma 5.9, (2), there is a hereditarily $\lambda$-slim $P$-name $\dot{x}$ such that

$$p \Vdash_P \text{“} \mathcal{H}(\lambda) \models \psi[\dot{x}, \dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}] \text{”}.$$

Since $|\,\mathrm{supp}(\dot{x})\,| < \lambda$, there is a bijection $j : \kappa \to \kappa$ such that $j\text{“}\mathrm{supp}(\dot{x}) \subseteq X$, $\tilde{j}(p) = p$ and $\tilde{j}(\dot{x}_i) = \dot{x}_i$ for all $i < n$ where $\tilde{j}$ is as in (n4). Then $\tilde{j}(\dot{x})$ is a $P_X$-name and

$$p \Vdash_P \text{“} \mathcal{H}(\lambda) \models \psi[\tilde{j}(\dot{x}), \dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}] \text{”}.$$

By induction hypothesis, it follows that

$$p \Vdash_{P_X} \text{“}\mathcal{H}(\lambda) \models \psi[\tilde{j}(\dot{x}), \dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}]\text{”}$$

and hence $p \Vdash_{P_X} \text{“}\mathcal{H}(\lambda) \models \exists x \psi[x, \dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}]\text{”}$.

Suppose now that

$$p \Vdash_{P_X} \text{“}\mathcal{H}(\lambda) \models \exists x \psi[x, \dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}]\text{”}.$$

Then there is a $P_X$-name $\dot{x}$ such that

$$p \Vdash_{P_X} \text{“}\mathcal{H}(\lambda) \models \psi[\dot{x}, \dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}]\text{”}.$$

By induction hypothesis, it follows that

$$p \Vdash_{P} \text{“}\mathcal{H}(\lambda) \models \psi[\dot{x}, \dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}]\text{”}$$

and hence $p \Vdash_{P} \text{“}\mathcal{H}(\lambda) \models \exists x \psi[x, \dot{x}_0, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n-1}]\text{”}$.

(2) follows immediately from (1). ❑ (Lemma 5.10)

**Proof of Theorem 5.7:** Let $\kappa$ be regular $P$ be a proper nice side-by-side $\kappa$-product of a partial ordering $Q$ of cardinality $\leq 2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1$. By Lemma 5.5, $P$ has the $\aleph_2$-cc. By this and properness, $P$ preserves cofinality and cardinals. Since $|P| \leq \kappa$ we have $2^{\aleph_0} \leq \kappa$. Hence by Lemma 3.1, (3), we have $\Vdash_P \text{“HP}(\lambda)\text{”}$ for every regular $\lambda > \kappa$. Let $\aleph_2 \leq \lambda \leq \kappa$ be $\aleph_0$-inaccessible and suppose that $p \in P$ and, $\dot{f}$ and $\dot{x}$ are $P$-names such that

$$p \Vdash_P \text{“}\dot{f} : \lambda \to \mathcal{P}(\omega),\ \dot{x} \in \mathcal{H}(\aleph_1)\text{”}$$

We would like to show:

$$p \Vdash_P \text{“(h0) or (h1) in the definition of HP}(\lambda) \text{ holds for } \dot{f} \text{ and } \dot{A}\text{”}$$

where $\dot{A}$ is a $P$-name such that for a first order formula $\varphi$ in the language of set theory and

$$p \Vdash_P \text{“}\dot{A} = \{u \in \mathcal{P}(\omega) : \mathcal{H}(\aleph_1) \models \varphi[u, \dot{x}]\}\text{”}.$$

By Lemma 5.9, (2), we may assume that $\dot{f}$ and $\dot{x}$ are $\lambda$-slim names. Hence there is $X \subseteq [\kappa]^\lambda$ such that $p \in P_X$ and, $\dot{f}$ and $\dot{x}$ are $P_X$-names. Since $P_X$ is a proper nice side-by-side $\lambda$-product of $Q$ and $\lambda$ is $\aleph_0$-inaccessible by assumption, we have $\Vdash_{P_X} \text{“HP}(\lambda)\text{”}$ by Theorem 5.2. Hence

$$p \Vdash_{P_X} \text{“(h0) or (h1) in the definition of HP}(\lambda) \text{ holds for } \dot{f} \text{ and } \dot{A}'\text{”}$$

where $\dot{A}'$ is a $P_X$-name such that

$$\Vdash_{P_X} \text{“}\dot{A}' = \{u \in \mathcal{P}(\omega) : \mathcal{H}(\aleph_1) \models \varphi[u, \dot{x}]\}\text{”}.$$

By Lemma 5.10 we have $p \Vdash_P \text{“}\dot{A}' = \dot{A} \cap \mathcal{H}(\aleph_1)^{V[G_X]}\text{”}$. Since $\Vdash_{P_X} \text{“}P_{\kappa\setminus X}$ has the $\lambda$-c.c.”, by Lemma 5.5, stationary subsets of $\lambda$ in the generic extension by $P_X$ are still stationary in the generic extension by $P$. Hence it follows that

$$\Vdash_P \text{“(h0) or (h1) in the definition of HP}(\lambda) \text{ holds for } \dot{f} \text{ and } \dot{A}\text{”}.$$

This shows $\Vdash_P \text{“HP}(\lambda)\text{”}$. ❑ (Theorem 5.7)

Now, let us turn to the models of IP. We need a well-known fact about product of partial orderings which is formulated here in the following lemma for nice side-by-side products:

**Lemma 5.11** *Let $P$ be a nice side-by-side $\kappa$-product of some partial ordering $Q$. Suppose that $X, Y \subseteq \kappa$ and $Z = X \cap Y$. For a $P$-generic filter $G$ over $V$, let $G_X = G \cap P_X$. By Lemma 5.1, (0) $G_X$ is a $P_X$-generic filter over $V$. Let $G_Y$ and $G_Z$ be defined similarly. If $x \in V[G_X] \cap \mathrm{On}$ is not an element of $V[G_Z]$ then $x$ is neither an element of $V[G_Y]$.*

**Proof**

By replacing $V$ with $V[G_Z]$ and $P$ with $P_{\kappa\setminus Z}$ we may assume that $Z = \emptyset$. Let $y \in V[G_Y] \cap \mathrm{On}$. We show that $x \neq y$. Let $\dot{x}$ be a $P_X$ name of $x$ and $\dot{y}$ a $P_Y$-name of $y$. For arbitrary $p \in G$, we have $p{\restriction} X \not\Vdash_{P_X} \text{“}\dot{x} \in V\text{”}$. Hence there is $\alpha \in \mathrm{On}$ such that $p{\restriction} X$ does not decide “$\alpha \in \dot{x}$” in $P_X$. Let $q \in P_Y$ be such that $q \leq p{\restriction} Y$ and $q$ decide “$\alpha \in \dot{y}$”, say $q \Vdash_{P_Y} \text{“}\alpha \in \dot{y}\text{”}$. Let $p' \in P_X$ be such that $p' \leq p{\restriction} X$ and $p' \Vdash_{P_X} \text{“}\alpha \notin \dot{x}\text{”}$. Then $p' \wedge q \leq p$ and $p' \wedge q \Vdash_P \text{“}\dot{x} \neq \dot{y}\text{”}$. ❑

**Theorem 5.12** *Let $\kappa$ be an $\aleph_0$-inaccessible cardinal and $\lambda \leq \kappa$. Suppose that $P$ is a proper nice side-by-side $\kappa$-product of a partial ordering $Q$ such that $|Q|^{\aleph_0} < \kappa$. If $P$ has the $\lambda$-cc, then $\Vdash_P \text{“IP}(\kappa, \lambda)\text{”}$.*

**Proof** Let $G$ be a $P$-generic filter over $V$. In $V[G]$, let $f : \kappa \to \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ and $g : (\mathcal{P}(\omega))^{<\aleph_0} \to \mathcal{P}(\omega)$ be definable, say by a formula $\varphi$. As in the proof of Theorem 5.2, we may assume that $\varphi$ has a real $a \in V[G]$ as its unique parameter. Let $\dot{f}$, $\dot{a}$ and $\dot{g}$ be $P$-names of $f$, $a$ and $g$ such that $\Vdash_P \text{“}\dot{f} : \kappa \to \mathcal{P}(\omega)\text{”}$, $\Vdash_P \text{“}\dot{g} : (\mathcal{P}(\omega))^{<\aleph_0} \to \mathcal{P}(\omega)\text{”}$ and

$$\Vdash_P \text{“}\forall \overline{x} \in (\mathcal{P}(\omega))^{<\aleph_0} \forall x \in \mathcal{P}(\omega)(\dot{g}(\overline{x}) = x \leftrightarrow \mathcal{H}(\aleph_1) \models \varphi(\overline{x}, x, \dot{a}))\text{”}.$$

Suppose that, for a $p \in G$, we have

$$p \Vdash_P \text{“(i0) does not hold for } \dot{f} \text{ and } \dot{g}\text{”}.$$

In particular we have

$$p \Vdash_P \text{“}\forall \alpha < \kappa(\{\beta \in \kappa : \dot{f}(\beta) = \dot{f}(\alpha)\} \text{ is non-stationary)”}.$$

**Claim 5.12.1** *There is a stationary $S \subseteq \kappa$ such that*

$$p \Vdash_P \text{“}\dot{f}\restriction S \text{ is 1-1”}.$$

$\vdash$ By assumption and the $\lambda$-cc of $P$ there are club sets $C_\alpha \subseteq \kappa$ for $\alpha < \kappa$ such that

$$p \Vdash_P \text{“}C_\alpha \cap \{\beta \in \kappa : \dot{f}(\beta) = \dot{f}(\alpha)\} = \emptyset\text{”}.$$

Then $S = \Delta_\alpha C_\alpha$ is club and hence stationary, and has the desired property. $\dashv$ (Claim 5.12.1)

We show that $p$ forces (i1) for these $\dot{f}$ and $\dot{g}$. Let $p' \leq p$ be arbitrary. It is enough to show that there is $p^* \leq p'$ forcing (i1). Similarly to the proof of Theorem 5.2, we can find a $p'' \leq p'$, a slim nice $P$-name $\dot{a}'$ of a real, a stationary $S^* \subseteq S$, a sequence $\langle \dot{x}'_\alpha : \alpha \in S^* \rangle$ of slim nice $P$-names and a sequence $\langle p_\alpha : \alpha \in S^* \rangle$ of conditions in $P$ such that

(a) $p'' \Vdash_P \text{“}\dot{a} = \dot{a}'\text{”}$ $p_\alpha \leq p''$ and $p_\alpha \Vdash_P \text{“}\dot{f}(\alpha) = \dot{x}'_\alpha\text{”}$ for every $\alpha \in S^*$;

(b) $d_\alpha = \mathrm{supp}(p_\alpha) \cup \mathrm{supp}(\dot{x}'_\alpha)$, $\alpha \in S^*$ are all of the same cardinality and form a $\Delta$-system with a root $r$. $\mathrm{supp}(\dot{a}') \cap d_\alpha \subseteq r$ for every $\alpha \in S^*$;

(c) for each $\alpha$, $\beta \in S^*$ there is a bijection $j_{\alpha,\beta} : \kappa \to \kappa$ such that $j_{\alpha,\beta}\restriction \kappa \setminus (d_\alpha \Delta d_\beta)$ is an identity mapping, $j_{\alpha,\beta}\text{“}d_\alpha = d_\beta$, $\tilde{j}_{\alpha,\beta}(p_\alpha) = p_\beta$ and $\tilde{j}_{\alpha,\beta}(\dot{x}'_\alpha) = \dot{x}'_\beta$ for every $\alpha$, $\beta \in S^*$, where $\tilde{j}_{\alpha,\beta}$ is as in Lemma 5.4;

By (c) $p_\alpha\restriction r$ for $\alpha \in S^*$ are all the same and is stronger than $p''$. Let $q = p_\alpha\restriction r$ for some/any $\alpha \in S^*$ and $\dot{S}$ be a $P$ name such that $\Vdash_P \text{“}\dot{S} = \{\alpha \in S^* : p_\alpha \in \dot{G}\}\text{”}$. By Lemma 5.6, it follows that

(d) $q \Vdash_P \text{“}\dot{S}$ is stationary”.

Hence, by assumption,

$$q \Vdash_P \text{“}\exists n \in \omega(|\, \dot{g}\text{“}\dot{f}\text{“}(\dot{S})^n \,| \geq \lambda)\text{”}.$$

Let $q' \leq q$ pin down the $n$ above as $n^* \in \omega$. Let $S^{**} = \{\alpha \in S^* : \mathrm{supp}(q') \cap \mathrm{supp}(p_\alpha) \subseteq r\}$. Then $S^{**}$ is still stationary subset of $\kappa$. Let $\langle \alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{n^*-1} \rangle \in (S^{**})^{n^*}$ and $q'' = q \wedge p_{\alpha_0} \wedge \cdots \wedge p_{\alpha^*-1}$.

**Claim 5.12.2**

$$q'' \not\Vdash_P \text{“}\dot{g}(\dot{f}(\alpha_0), \ldots, \dot{f}(\alpha_{n^*-1})) \in V[\dot{G}_r]\text{”}$$

$\vdash$ Otherwise, by the $\lambda$-cc of $P$, there is a $P_r$-name $\dot{X}$ such that $\Vdash_{P_r}$ "$|\dot{X}| < \lambda$" and

$$q'' \Vdash_P \text{“}\dot{g}(\dot{f}(\alpha_0), \dots, \dot{f}(\alpha_{n^*-1})) \in \dot{X}\text{”}.$$

Hence, by (c), it follows that $q'' \Vdash_P$ "$\dot{g}$"$\dot{f}$"$(\dot{S})^n \subseteq \dot{X}$". This is a contradiction to the choice of $n^*$ and $q''$. $\dashv$ (Claim 5.12.2)

Let $p^* \leq q''$ be such that

$$p^* \Vdash_P \text{“}\dot{g}(\dot{f}(\alpha_0), \dots, \dot{f}(\alpha_{n^*-1})) \notin V[\dot{G}_r]\text{”}.$$

By shrinking $S^{**}$, if necessary, we may assume that $\mathrm{supp}(p^*) \cap \mathrm{supp}(p_\alpha) \subseteq r$ for all $\alpha \in S^{**}$. For $i < n^*$, let $\dot{D}_i$ be a $P$-name such that

$$\Vdash_P \text{“}\dot{D}_i = \{\alpha \in S^{**} : \tilde{j}_{\alpha_i,\alpha}(p^*) \in \dot{G}\}\text{”}.$$

Then, by Lemma 5.6, we have $p^* \Vdash_P$ "$\dot{D}_i$ is a stationary subset of $\kappa$" for all $i < n^*$. By definition of $\dot{D}_i$'s, we have

$$\begin{aligned} p^* \Vdash_P \text{“}&\forall\beta_0 \cdots \forall\beta_{n^*-1}(\langle\beta_0, \dots, \beta_{n^*-1}\rangle \in (\dot{D}_0, \dots, \dot{D}_{n^*-1}) \\ &\to \dot{g}(\dot{f}(\beta_0), \dots, \dot{f}(\beta_{n^*-1})) \notin V[\dot{G}_r])\text{”}. \end{aligned}$$

In general, the support of $P$-names $\dot{y}(\beta_0, \dots, \beta_{n^*-1})$ of $\dot{g}(\dot{f}(\beta_0), \dots, \dot{f}(\beta_{n^*-1}))$ for $\langle\beta_0, \dots, \beta_{n^*-1}\rangle \in (S^{**})^{n^*}$ can be anything. But since $g$ is forced to be definable by $\varphi$, we can apply Lemma 5.10 to choose these names so that

$$\mathrm{supp}(\dot{y}(\beta_0, \dots, \beta_{n^*-1})) \cap \mathrm{supp}(\dot{y}(\beta'_0, \dots, \beta'_{n^*-1})) \subseteq r,$$

whenever $\beta_0, \dots, \beta_{n^*-1}, \beta'_0, \dots, \beta'_{n^*-1} \in S^{**}$ are pairwise distinct. Hence, by Lemma 5.11, we conclude that $p^* \Vdash_P$ "(i1) holds." $\square$ (Theorem 5.12)

Similarly to the proof of Theorem 5.7, we can now proof the following:

**Theorem 5.13** *Suppose that $\kappa$ is a regular cardinal and $P$ is a proper nice side-by-side $\kappa$-product of a partial ordering $Q$ of cardinality $\leq 2^{\aleph_0}$. Then for any $\aleph_0$-inaccessible $\lambda$ we have $\Vdash_P$ "$\mathrm{IP}(\lambda, \aleph_2)$". In particular, if* GCH *holds and $\aleph_2 \geq \kappa < \aleph_\omega$, then $\Vdash_P$ "IP". If further $P$ satisfies the ccc then $\Vdash_P$ "$\mathrm{IP}^+$".* $\square$

**Corollary 5.14**

(a) $\mathrm{MA}(countable) + (\clubsuit) + \mathrm{HP} + \mathrm{IP} + 2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_n$ *is consistent relative to* ZFC *for every $n \in \omega$, $n \geq 1$.*

(b) $\mathrm{MA}(Cohen) + \mathrm{HP} + \mathrm{IP}^+ + 2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_n$ *is consistent relative to* ZFC *for every $n \in \omega$, $n \geq 1$.* $\square$

Finally, we would like to mention the following open problems:

**Problem 5.15** *Does* $\mathrm{IP}(\kappa)$ *imply* $\mathrm{HP}(\kappa)$ *or vice versa ?*

**Problem 5.16** *Is* $\mathrm{HP}(\aleph_{\omega+1})$ *(or* $\mathrm{IP}(\aleph_{\omega+1})$*) consistent with* $2^{\aleph_0} > \aleph_\omega$ *?*

Note that the second problem could be also formulated as whether HP (or IP) implies that $2^{\aleph_0} < \aleph_\omega$.

**Acknowledgment.** I would like to thank Lajos Soukup and Yoshihiro Abe for pointing out several minor errors in an earlier version of the paper.

# References


[1] U. Abraham, S. Shelah: Martin's axiom and $\Delta^2_1$ well-ordering of the reals, Archive for Mathematical Logic, 35 (1996), 287–298.

[2] J.E. Baumgartner: Iterated forcing, in: A. Mathias (ed.), *Surverys in Set Theory*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series #87, Cambridge University Press, (1983).

[3] M. Bekkali: *Topics in Topology*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 1476, Springer-Verlag (1991).

[4] I. Juhász, L. Soukup and Z. Szentmiklóssy, Combinatorial principles from adding cohen reals, to appear in Proceedings of Logic Colloquium (1995).

[5] A. Dow: An introduction to applications of elementary submodels to topology, Topology Proceedings 13 (1988), 17–72.

[6] S. Fuchino, S. Koppelberg and S. Shelah, Partial orderings with the weak Freese-Nation property, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, 80 (1996), 35–54.

[7] S. Fuchino, S. Shelah and L. Soukup, Sticks and Clubs, submitted.

[8] K. Kunen: *Set Theory*, North-Holland (1980).

[9] S. Todorcevic: *Partition Problems in Topology*, Contemporary Mathematics, Vol. 84, AMS (1989).



**Author's address**

Sakaé Fuchino

*Institut für Mathematik II,*
*Freie Universität Berlin*
*14195 Berlin, Germany*

fuchino@math.fu-berlin.de